

MIHAELA SANDU, PhD

WINNING ERASMUS+ PROJECTS

From Idea to Funding Success

A Practical Guide to KA210
Small-scale Partnerships

2026 EDITION

AFEDE PUBLISHING

Constanța, Romania

2026

WINNING ERASMUS+ PROJECTS

From Idea to Funding Success

A Practical Guide to KA210 Small-scale Partnerships

2026 Edition

Author

Mihaela Sandu, PhD

AFEDE Publishing

Constanța • 2026

WINNING ERASMUS+ PROJECTS

From Idea to Funding Success

A Practical Guide to KA210 Small-scale Partnerships

Author	Mihaela Sandu, PhD
Publisher	AFEDE Publishing
Place and year	Constanța • 2026
Publication format	Electronic publication • PDF
ISBN	978-630-95433-1-8
Website	https://afede.ro
Editorial contact	contact@afede.ro

© 2026 Mihaela Sandu. All rights reserved.

Published by AFEDE Publishing.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or distributed for commercial purposes without permission from the copyright holder, except for brief quotations used for review, research or educational reference.

IMPORTANT. This is an independent educational publication. It is not an official publication of the European Commission, EACEA or any Erasmus+ National Agency. Erasmus+ rules, forms, deadlines and platform features can change. Always check the current Erasmus+ Programme Guide, the current application form and the instructions of the competent National Agency before submitting an application.

The practical drafting frameworks in this book are intended as planning aids. They should not be copied verbatim into an application. The 2026 KA210-SCH application conditions require original content authored by the applicant organisation.

Historical extracts are reproduced from the author's 2021 application and are clearly labelled as historical. Their strategic logic may remain useful, but the 2021 form and funding calculations must not be treated as current 2026 rules.

Preface: Why this guide?

Erasmus+ applications can look technical because the form asks several different questions about the same project: needs, objectives, priorities, partnership, activities, budget, impact and follow-up. The difficulty is not producing more text. It is making every section tell the same project story from a different angle.

This edition has been rebuilt around that principle. It follows the logic of the 2026 KA210 application, removes outdated unit-cost budgeting from the main guidance, distinguishes mandatory rules from good practice, and uses a real funded project as a historical case study rather than as a template to copy.

The objective is practical: by the end of the book, you should be able to test whether your project is coherent before you spend time polishing individual answers.

EDITORIAL PRINCIPLE

Good applications are not collections of impressive sentences. They are coherent systems: a verified need leads to a measurable objective; the objective justifies an activity; the activity produces an observable result; the result supports impact; and the budget is proportionate to the work.

About the author

Mihaela Sandu, PhD, works in education, European project development and international cooperation. Her practice combines classroom experience, project design, partnership building and the development of educational resources for schools and organisations.

The historical case study used in this book is Young Ecologists on a Mission: Saving Our Seas (2021-2-RO01-KA210-SCH-000047905). In the Romanian selection results for the EUR 60,000 KA210-SCH round, the project is listed first, with 89 points and a EUR 60,000 approved grant.

Through AFEDE - the Association for Education, Training and European Development - she develops training, resources and cooperation initiatives related to European education and project development.

How to use this book

Read the book in two passes. The first pass is strategic: Chapters 1-5 help you decide whether the project logic is strong enough to write. The second pass is technical: Chapters 6-11 help you translate that logic into the form and run a final quality check.

Symbol / box	Meaning
2026 RULE	A requirement or rule supported by the current Programme Guide or application form.
CASE STUDY	A lesson drawn from the 2021 funded project. Historical content is not current programme law.
EDITOR'S NOTE	A precision, caveat or correction that prevents overclaiming.
CHECKLIST	A quality-control test before you move to the next section.

Terminology follows EU English: organisation, programme, Small-scale Partnership, participating organisations, target groups, fewer opportunities, results, impact and dissemination.

Contents

Section	Title	Page
Introduction	What KA210 is - and what changed by 2026	8
Quick Start	The one-page roadmap	10
Chapter 1	Relevance: needs, priorities and European added value	11
Chapter 2	Objectives and project logic	15
Chapter 3	Participating organisations and partnership quality	18
Chapter 4	Cooperation arrangements, management and quality	20
Chapter 5	Activities: from ideas to a coherent work plan	23
Chapter 6	Budget: the KA210 lump-sum model	26
Chapter 7	Impact, evaluation and evidence	29
Chapter 8	Follow-up, dissemination and sustainability	31
Chapter 9	Writing the application form and project summary	34
Chapter 10	Ten high-risk mistakes before submission	37
Chapter 11	Adaptable drafting frameworks - use, do not copy	40
Appendix A	2026 form map and final submission checklist	43
Appendix B	Historical 2021 case-study extracts	45
References	Official sources and further reading	50

INTRODUCTION

What KA210 is - and what changed by 2026

A KA210 Small-scale Partnership is a transnational cooperation project designed to be accessible to smaller, less experienced or newcomer organisations. It is not a mobility scheme with a co-operation label. Mobility or transnational meetings can be part of the project, but they must contribute to the project objectives.

2026 RULE

A Small-scale Partnership involves at least two organisations from two different EU Member States or third countries associated to the Programme. There is no general maximum number of participating organisations.

2026 design parameter	KA210 Small-scale Partnership
Minimum partnership	2 organisations from 2 different eligible countries
Project duration	6-24 months
Grant model	One predefined lump sum: EUR 30,000 or EUR 60,000
Priorities	At least one horizontal priority and/or one relevant sector-specific priority
Award threshold	At least 60/100 overall and at least half of the maximum score in every criterion category
Core quality areas	Relevance; quality of design and implementation; partnership/cooperation; impact
Digital dimension	Virtual cooperation and blended learning can strengthen design; school projects are strongly encouraged to use the European School Education Platform/eTwinning where relevant

Source: European Commission, Erasmus+ Programme Guide 2026, Small-scale Partnerships.

The central change that affects this book

The 2021 case study used detailed travel, accommodation and participant-based calculations because the form and funding context were different. That logic cannot be copied into a 2026 KA210 budget chapter. In 2026, the application is built around a chosen lump sum. You estimate the real overall cost internally, choose EUR 30,000 or EUR 60,000, allocate grant amounts to project activities, and explain how each activity amount was determined.

EDITOR'S NOTE

This is why the original edition's unit-cost tables, distance-band examples, course-fee lines and "green travel grant" calculations have been removed from the current guidance. They may be relevant in other Erasmus+ actions, but they are not the budgeting architecture of a 2026 KA210 application.

Think in one chain, not eleven chapters

Use the following logic as your master test:

Question	Evidence in the application
What is wrong or missing now?	Needs assessment and organisational context
Why is this a European cooperation problem?	Priority alignment and European added value
What change will the project deliver?	Objectives and indicators
Why these organisations?	Complementarity and roles
What will they actually do?	Activities and cooperation arrangements
What resources are proportionate?	Activity-based lump-sum rationale
How will you know it worked - and what remains?	Evaluation, results, impact, integration, dissemination and sustainability

QUICK START

The one-page roadmap

1. Start with a documented problem or development need. Do not start with a destination, meeting or list of activities.
2. Check the current Programme Guide and the National Agency's priorities before you commit to a project theme.
3. Select the main priority because the project genuinely contributes to it - not because it sounds fundable.
4. Define 2-4 project objectives that describe measurable change, not tasks.
5. Build a partnership in which each organisation contributes something necessary and credible.
6. Design a limited set of activities. For each one, state purpose, participants/beneficiaries, contribution to objectives, expected results, timing, lead organisation and allocated grant amount.
7. Estimate the full real cost of the project internally. Choose the EUR 30,000 or EUR 60,000 lump sum that fits the scale and expected results, respecting the co-financing principle.
8. Define indicators before writing the impact section. Decide who measures what, when, and with which instrument.
9. Write the project summary after the full application is coherent.
10. Run a cross-section consistency check, then submit before the final hour. Always verify the current deadline in the call and National Agency instructions.

STOP HERE IF

Your project can only be explained as “we want to visit partner countries and exchange good practices”. That is an activity idea, not yet a project rationale.

CHAPTER 1

Relevance: needs, priorities and European added value

The evaluator should be able to see a real problem, a credible diagnosis and a clear reason for European cooperation.

1.1 Start with the need, not the solution

A weak application begins with an activity: “We will organise four international meetings.” A stronger application begins with evidence: “Our participating organisations face a shared gap in X, demonstrated by Y, affecting Z target group. Existing local measures do not solve the problem because...” The activities appear later as the response.

Use evidence proportionately

- Internal data: attendance, achievement, participation, digital-use data, staff surveys, student questionnaires, institutional self-evaluation.
- External data: credible European, national or regional evidence that confirms the wider relevance of the problem.
- Qualitative evidence: structured interviews, focus groups, feedback from target groups and staff observations.
- Partner comparison: show what is shared and what differs across participating countries or organisations.

EDITOR'S NOTE

A SWOT analysis can be useful, but it is not a requirement and it is not inherently stronger than other needs-assessment methods. Use it only if it produces evidence that feeds directly into objectives and activities.

1.2 Select priorities accurately

2026 RULE

Small-scale Partnerships must address at least one horizontal priority and/or at least one specific priority relevant to the field most affected by the project. Do not state that every KA210 must choose a horizontal priority: that is too broad.

Priority alignment should work in both directions. The project should contribute to the priority, and the priority should help explain why the project matters. Merely naming “inclusion”, “digital transformation” or “environment” does not create alignment.

Weak alignment	Stronger alignment
“Our project supports inclusion.”	Identify the barrier, the affected target group, the design measure that removes the barrier and the indicator that will show improved access or participation.
“We will use digital tools.”	Explain which learning/cooperation problem the tool solves, how partners will use it, and what competence or process will improve.
“We care about sustainability.”	Link environmental choices to project content and implementation, with concrete actions rather than decorative language.

1.3 Prove European added value

Transnationality is not automatically European added value. The question is what the partnership can create, test, compare or transfer that would be weaker or impossible in a purely local project.

- Different expertise: one partner contributes a method, another a target-group perspective, another implementation capacity.
- Comparable challenge, different contexts: partners test the same approach under different educational or institutional conditions.
- Transferability: the consortium produces a model that can be used beyond a single local context.

- Mutual capacity building: partners develop competence through structured peer learning rather than tourism.

1.4 Historical case study: what remains transferable

In the 2021 Young Ecologists application, the needs section connected local coastal pollution, gaps in ecological knowledge and communication, and a shared coastal context across partner countries. The enduring lesson is the sequence: context -> diagnosed gap -> target group -> transnational reason -> project response.

Paraphrased content from the 2021 application

The partnership presented coastal pollution as both an environmental and an educational problem. The participating schools were located in coastal communities and already had experience with ecological projects, volunteering and international collaboration. At the same time, their internal diagnosis identified gaps in practical environmental research, knowledge of European policy, communication of ecological messages and sustained student engagement.

The project therefore proposed a common response built around beach investigation, public-awareness campaigns and ecological education. Its transnational rationale was that schools from different European coastal areas could compare local realities, exchange monitoring methods and multiply the reach of the same civic message across several communities.

- Strengths identified: direct experience of coastal environments, previous ecological activities, volunteering capacity, language/digital/artistic skills and existing school cooperation.
- Weaknesses and threats identified: limited knowledge of other European coastal realities, insufficient practical research experience, limited knowledge of EU policy, communication gaps and disengagement from environmental action.
- European added value claimed: students and teachers would work as “ecology messengers” in different countries, compare approaches and develop joint solutions that could influence several local communities rather than only one.

SOURCE NOTE

Paraphrased from the 2021 KA210-SCH application, Project Description, pp. 5-6. No application screenshot is reproduced here.

CASE-STUDY LESSON

The strongest element is not the environmental vocabulary. It is the attempt to show why the problem matters to the participating organisations and target groups. In a 2026 application, make that link more evidence-based and more concise.

1.5 Chapter checklist

- The problem is supported by at least one credible source of evidence.
- The target group is specific enough to understand who is affected.
- The selected priority is reflected in objectives and activities, not merely named.
- The application explains why cooperation across countries adds value.
- The needs section does not pre-empt the entire application with a long list of activities.
- Character limits are taken from the current form, not from old examples or generic rules.

CHAPTER 2

Objectives and project logic

Objectives are promises of change. Activities are the work you do to fulfil those promises.

2.1 The needs-objectives-results chain

Need	Objective	Activity	Result / evidence
Teachers use fragmented approaches to media literacy.	By project end, participating schools will implement a shared media-literacy framework in at least two learning contexts.	Co-design workshops; teacher testing; peer review.	Framework adopted; lesson evidence; staff self-assessment; observation data.
Students have low confidence in evaluating online information.	Increase the proportion of participating students who correctly apply a source-evaluation protocol from baseline to final assessment.	Student labs; source-analysis tasks; international peer sessions.	Pre/post task scores; student products; reflection logs.

2.2 SMART is useful - if the indicator is meaningful

Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound objectives are useful, but avoid artificial percentages. An objective is not stronger because it contains “80%” if there is no baseline, instrument or credible reason for that target.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Do not force one objective for every need merely to create symmetry. The important test is traceability: every material need should be addressed, and every objective should have a clear justification.

A stronger objective formula

DRAFTING FRAME

By [time], [target group/organisation] will [observable change], measured by [indicator/instrument], from [baseline or current state] to [realistic target], through [main intervention logic].

2.3 Build indicators at the same time

Indicator type	Example	Why it matters
Output	4 tested learning sequences produced	Shows delivery, not impact by itself
Outcome	Teachers apply the shared method independently	Shows behaviour/capacity change
Participation	At least X participants from defined target groups complete the pilot	Shows reach and inclusion
Quality	Minimum agreed rubric score for pilot resources	Shows standard, not just quantity
Sustainability	Method incorporated into institutional plan / recurring activity	Shows continuation beyond grant period

2.4 Historical case study: objectives

The 2021 application stated concrete aims around environmental knowledge, research skills, communication and civic awareness. The transferable lesson is the attempt to connect knowledge, competence and behaviour. A 2026 rewrite should make the measurement method explicit and avoid ungrounded percentages.

2021 objective	Paraphrased case-study content
Civic reach	Increase civic involvement among at least 1,000 people, including 200 students aged 14-18, through awareness and community action.
Community awareness	Reach 12 communities in Romania, Italy, Spain and Turkey with campaigns on clean beaches, marine pollution and responsible behaviour.
Student behaviour and knowledge	Enable the 200 participating students to value pollution-free coastal areas and act as responsible citizens; the application also set a target that 75% could identify three ways to reduce beach pollution and three ways to

	reduce water pollution.
Competence development	Develop practical, artistic, linguistic, digital, communication and ICT competences among at least 50% of participating students and all participating teachers, so they could communicate the consequences of plastic waste and propose preventive solutions.

The expected results extended beyond the objectives: stronger links with local communities and civil society; better understanding of coastal biodiversity; improved beach-investigation methods; presentation of research findings in English; exhibitions, films, information panels and a Beach Calendar; a good-practice guide; and a project website intended to remain usable after the grant period.

SOURCE NOTE

Paraphrased from the 2021 KA210-SCH application, Project Description, p. 5. Preserve the logic, but redesign indicators for the current call.

2.5 Chapter checklist

- Every objective describes a change rather than an activity.
- Every objective is connected to at least one verified need.
- Each target can be measured with a named instrument or data source.
- Targets are credible and do not rely on decorative percentages.
- The project can realistically achieve the objectives within 6-24 months and the chosen lump sum.

CHAPTER 3

Participating organisations and partnership quality

A strong consortium is not the largest consortium. It is the smallest credible group that contains the expertise and implementation capacity the project needs.

3.1 Minimum partnership and selection logic

2026 RULE

The minimum is two organisations from two different eligible countries. There is no general maximum number. More partners are not automatically better: each additional organisation must add value and remain manageable.

Select partners against the project logic, not against geography alone. Ask what competence, access, target group, institutional role or implementation environment each organisation contributes.

Selection question	Evidence to include
Why this organisation?	Relevant experience, staff competence, access to target group, specific institutional strength
Why in this project?	Direct connection to a need, objective or activity
What will it lead?	Named responsibility with realistic workload
What will it learn?	Capacity-development benefit
What happens if it disappears?	Identify which project function would be weakened - this tests real complementarity

3.2 Describe organisations for relevance, not biography

The application does not need a promotional history of each institution. Select facts that explain capacity to deliver the proposed work. A concise description of relevant learners, staff, prior experience, facilities, networks or methods is more valuable than a long institutional profile.

3.3 Newcomers and experienced partners

Small-scale Partnerships are intended to widen access, including for newcomers and less experienced organisations. A balanced partnership can include both experienced and newer organisations. The key is to define support and responsibility without turning the experienced coordinator into the only real actor.

3.4 Partnership matrix

Partner	Relevant asset	Lead responsibility	Contribution to quality
Coordinator	Project-design and sector expertise	Overall coordination; integration of outputs	Coherence, reporting, shared standards
Partner A	Target-group access and pilot capacity	Pilot implementation	Real-world testing and feedback
Partner B	Digital or methodological expertise	Resource design / digital cooperation	Technical and pedagogical quality
Partner C	Dissemination/network reach	Transfer and stakeholder engagement	Wider uptake and sustainability

3.5 Chapter checklist

- ☐ The partnership meets the minimum eligibility rule.
- ☐ Every organisation has a project-specific reason to participate.
- ☐ Lead roles are distributed rather than concentrated entirely in the coordinator.
- ☐ Partner descriptions use verifiable capacities, not vague superlatives.
- ☐ The number of partners remains proportionate to the grant, duration and management capacity.

CHAPTER 4

Cooperation arrangements, management and quality

Management should make the project look controllable: clear decisions, clear ownership, clear evidence and clear responses when something goes wrong.

4.1 Answer the cooperation questions directly

The 2026 application asks how the partnership was formed, what strengths each partner brings, how sound management and communication will be ensured, how Erasmus+ platforms or tools will be used where relevant, and how tasks and responsibilities are divided. Treat these as management-design questions, not as opportunities for generic language.

4.2 A simple governance model

Level	Purpose	Typical evidence
Strategic	Decisions on scope, risks, major changes	Steering group; decision log; escalation rule
Operational	Monthly coordination and task follow-up	Action list; milestone tracker; shared workspace
Quality	Review of deliverables and implementation	Rubrics; peer review; acceptance criteria
Financial	Activity allocations and internal cost control	Internal budget; partner agreements; documented approvals
Safeguarding / data	Participant protection and lawful data handling	Consent, privacy, risk and safeguarding procedures as relevant

4.3 Digital cooperation tools: useful, not magical

Name tools only when you explain their function. A shared drive can hold version-controlled documents; a project-management board can track actions; videoconferencing can support monthly decisions. In school education, the European School Education Platform and eTwinning can support virtual cooperation and blended learning where relevant.

EDITOR'S NOTE

eTwinning/TwinSpace is not a universal “must” for a high-scoring KA210. The Programme Guide strongly encourages its use for school projects where relevant. Do not present good practice as a formal eligibility condition.

4.4 Task distribution

Use a responsibility matrix that shows one lead and contributing partners for each material task. Avoid the “one-person project” problem: if the coordinator writes everything, manages everything, evaluates everything and disseminates everything, the partnership may look ornamental.

Responsibility area	How the 2021 partnership distributed it
Local visibility	Every school was responsible for local promotion through its website, a project panel and local communication activities.
Beach investigation	Each host school had to organise a field activity on a nearby beach. The Italian partner had a specific responsibility for sharing observation and environmental-analysis methods.
Photo exhibitions / calendar	Every school organised a photo exhibition based on its local coastline; selected photographs fed into a common Seaside Calendar, coordinated by the Romanian partner.
EcoSeas contest	Each school organised a local stage of the contest; the Turkish partner held the coordinating responsibility.
Teaching integration	Every school had to organise at least one natural-sciences demonstration lesson integrating investigation of the local beach environment.
Online dissemination	Project activities were to be promoted through the project website and Facebook page, with the Spanish partner responsible for this strand.
Management	The coordinating school centralised project management and reporting; financial management involved the coordinator and partner-school accounting staff, with a separate legal-management responsibility.

SOURCE NOTE

Paraphrased from the 2021 KA210-SCH application, Cooperation Arrangements, p. 17. The useful lesson is visible ownership, not the historical tools or labels.

4.5 Risk and quality control

Risk	Early warning	Mitigation	Owner
Partner task delay	Milestone missed by agreed tolerance	Recovery plan; redistribute support; revised internal deadline	Task lead + coordinator
Low target-group participation	Registration / attendance below threshold	Early recruitment; alternative channels; accessibility measures	Local partner
Output fails quality standard	Peer-review rubric below threshold	Revision cycle; expert review; limited re-pilot	Quality lead
Travel / event disruption	Venue or travel uncertainty	Hybrid/virtual alternative where objectives can still be met	Activity lead

4.6 Chapter checklist

- Decision-making and conflict-resolution rules are explicit.
- Each major task has a lead and a realistic contributor structure.
- The digital tools named have a clear management or learning purpose.
- Quality criteria are defined before outputs are produced.
- Risks include triggers, mitigation and responsibility - not just a list of threats.

CHAPTER 5

Activities: from ideas to a coherent work plan

A project activity is justified by the change it creates, not by the number of people who travel.

5.1 What the 2026 form expects for each activity

- Activity title, venue and estimated timing/duration.
- Lead organisation and participating organisations.
- Grant amount allocated to the activity.
- Description of the activity content.
- Target group: who takes part and who benefits.
- Explanation of how the activity contributes to project objectives.
- Expected results.
- Explanation of how the allocated grant amount was determined.

Source: European Commission, KA210-SCH 2026 application form template.

5.2 Design the activity from objective to result

Design step	Question
Purpose	Which objective does this activity advance?
Participants / beneficiaries	Who must participate for the activity to work, and who benefits afterwards?
Method	What will participants actually do?
Output / result	What observable product, competence, decision or change will exist afterwards?
Evidence	How will you verify completion and quality?
Follow-up	How does the next activity use the result?

Cost logic

Why is the allocated grant amount proportionate to this design?

5.3 Do not build a project around “mobilities”

Transnational teaching, training, learning or meeting activities can be justified when they contribute to objectives. But a KA210 can also include local pilots, online co-design, stakeholder sessions, testing, resource development, evaluation and dissemination. The activity portfolio should reflect what the project needs, not a travel quota.

2026 DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Virtual cooperation and blended learning can add continuity before and after physical activities. Use them when they strengthen learning, co-design or access - not as a cosmetic “digital bonus”.

5.4 Example activity chain

Activity	Purpose	Main result	Feeds into
A1 Needs validation and common framework	Agree baseline and common method	Baseline report + framework	A2
A2 Digital co-design labs	Develop prototype resources	Prototype set + peer review	A3
A3 Transnational learning lab	Test methods intensively across partner groups	Test data + revised tools	A4
A4 Local pilots	Test transferability in each organisation	Pilot evidence + local adaptations	A5
A5 Evaluation, transfer and dissemination	Validate, integrate and share	Final toolkit + adoption plans	Sustainability plans

5.5 Chapter checklist

- ☐ Every activity has a direct link to at least one objective.
- ☐ The target group and beneficiaries are distinguished where necessary.
- ☐ Expected results are observable, not vague statements such as “participants will learn a lot”.

- Physical mobility is justified by purpose, not treated as the project objective.
- The activity sequence shows dependencies and follow-up.
- The grant allocation can be explained from the scale and resource needs of the activity.

CHAPTER 6

Budget: the KA210 lump-sum model

Budgeting is not a catalogue of Erasmus+ unit costs. It is a proportionality test between the work promised and the lump sum requested.

2026 RULE

KA210 Small-scale Partnerships use two predefined lump sums: EUR 30,000 and EUR 60,000. The applicant chooses one amount based on the activities and results. The estimated overall project cost should be higher than the chosen lump sum because the model reflects the co-financing principle.

6.1 The four-step budget workflow

1. Estimate the real full cost of the entire project internally. Include the resources actually needed to deliver the work, whether or not the form displays them as separate cost categories.
2. Test scale: can the project realistically deliver its objectives for EUR 30,000, or does the work justify EUR 60,000?
3. Allocate the chosen grant across planned activities. The activity allocations must add up exactly to the requested lump sum.
4. For every activity, explain how you determined the amount. Link the amount to duration, number/type of participants, travel or meeting needs where relevant, staff effort, materials, accessibility, digital production, local implementation and other necessary resources - without pretending that KA210 uses a fixed unit-cost table.

6.2 Worked example: EUR 60,000 project

Activity	Internal full-cost estimate	Grant allocated	Rationale
A1 Needs validation and common framework	EUR 6,500	EUR 5,500	Staff preparation, partner workshops, baseline tools, framework drafting
A2 Digital co-design labs	EUR 9,200	EUR 8,000	Online co-design, resource production, accessibility and review
A3 Transnational learning lab	EUR 20,500	EUR 17,000	Travel/hosting needs, learning programme, materials, participant support
A4 Local pilots in partner countries	EUR 18,000	EUR 16,500	Local implementation, materials, staff time, data collection
A5 Evaluation, transfer and dissemination	EUR 14,000	EUR 13,000	Evaluation, finalisation, translation/adaptation, dissemination and integration
TOTAL	EUR 68,200	EUR 60,000	Full estimated cost exceeds the lump sum; internal planning identifies the co-financed difference

IMPORTANT

The figures above are an illustrative planning model, not official rates. The application's grant amount is the lump sum. Internal full-cost estimates exist to demonstrate feasibility, economy, efficiency and co-financing.

6.3 What was removed from the original budget chapter - and why

The earlier manuscript presented project management monthly rates, travel distance bands, individual support, course fees, inclusion support and green-travel grant amounts as if they were the current KA210 budgeting structure. That would mislead a 2026 applicant. Those mechanisms belong to other Erasmus+ actions or older contexts and should not be used as a KA210-SCH 2026 budget template.

6.4 Budget quality tests

- The project's full internal cost estimate is realistic and exceeds the selected lump sum.
- The selected lump sum is proportionate to the scale, complexity and expected results.
- Activity allocations add up exactly to EUR 30,000 or EUR 60,000.
- Every activity allocation has a plausible resource rationale.
- No activity looks inflated merely to reach the grant total.
- Accessibility and inclusion-related costs are considered inside the activity design where needed.
- The narrative, participant numbers, duration and budget rationale are consistent across sections.

CHAPTER 7

Impact, evaluation and evidence

Impact is the change produced by the project. Evaluation is how you know whether that change happened.

7.1 Separate outputs, outcomes and impact

Level	Question	Example
Output	What did the project produce?	Toolkit, learning sequence, training session, digital resource
Outcome	What changed for participants or organisations?	Improved competence; new method used; stronger cooperation practice
Impact	What broader or longer-term change follows?	Practice integrated institutionally; wider uptake; improved participation or quality

7.2 Build an evaluation matrix

Objective / result	Indicator	Instrument	Timing	Owner
Teacher-method adoption	Number and proportion applying shared method	Observation rubric + implementation log	Baseline / pilot / final	Quality lead
Student competence	Change in assessed source-evaluation performance	Common pre/post task	Before first pilot / after final pilot	Local partners
Resource quality	Minimum rubric threshold achieved	Peer-review rubric	Prototype and final	Methodology lead
Institutional integration	Number of partners with approved continuation measure	Action plan / decision record	Final 2 months	Coordinator

7.3 Use qualitative evidence carefully

Testimonials and satisfaction surveys can add context, but they are weak as the only evidence for competence or behavioural change. Triangulate when possible: combine participation data, assessment evidence, observation, outputs and stakeholder feedback.

7.4 Historical case study: impact logic

The 2021 application used questionnaires, observation, competitions, student products and institutional continuation measures. The transferable lesson is to define several levels of evidence. A 2026 version should streamline the instruments and link each one explicitly to an objective or expected result.

7.5 Chapter checklist

- Impact statements identify who changes and what changes.
- Each objective has at least one meaningful indicator.
- The evaluation instrument can actually measure the claimed change.
- Baseline and final measurement points are defined where relevant.
- Responsibility for data collection and interpretation is assigned.
- The evaluation plan is proportionate to a small-scale project.

CHAPTER 8

Follow-up, dissemination and sustainability

Dissemination is not a final Facebook post. Follow-up starts when the project design identifies who should use the results and what should remain after funding.

8.1 Design dissemination by audience

Audience	What matters to them?	Channel / format	Evidence
Participants / staff	Practical use of results	Internal workshops, repository, peer coaching	Use logs; attendance; feedback
Other schools / organisations	Replicable method and resources	Webinar, toolkit, professional networks	Downloads; registrations; adoption requests
Local stakeholders	Local relevance and visible outcomes	Briefing, event, local media	Stakeholder participation; follow-up actions
European community	Transferability and European learning	Erasmus+ Project Results Platform; relevant European networks	Published results; reuse / contact evidence

8.2 Replace obsolete platform references

Do not recommend the former School Education Gateway as a current platform. In school education, refer to the European School Education Platform and eTwinning where relevant. Use the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform for project-result visibility as required or appropriate under the grant and programme arrangements.

8.3 Sustainability must name an owner

A result is not sustainable because it “will remain online for five years”. Sustainable design names what continues, who is responsible, which organisational process absorbs the result, and what resources are needed after the grant.

Sustainability claim	Stronger version
“The toolkit will remain online.”	Partner X will maintain the resource in the institutional repository; each partner will integrate two activities into its annual education plan and review use once per year.
“The partnership will continue.”	Partners will retain the shared working group for annual peer review and one joint European activity; the coordinator will schedule the first post-project review before project closure.

8.4 Historical case study: dissemination

Action	Audience and purpose	Timing / ownership
Project web and Facebook pages	Students, teachers, parents and the wider local/virtual community; present the project identity, objectives, contacts and progress.	Launch phase; project team.
Press conference	Students, teachers, local authorities, local press and possible partners; announce the project and explain its relevance to the community.	Early project phase; project team.
EcoSeas Corner	Students, teachers and parents; a permanent school display with project information, implementation stages, ecological messages, results and a visitors' notebook.	Throughout implementation; participating students and teachers.
Press / radio-TV visibility	Local, regional and national audiences; periodic coverage of activities and results.	Throughout implementation; students and teachers.
Post-mobility dissemination sessions	Students, teachers and local community; transfer mobility results and examples of good practice.	Within two weeks of each mobility; project team.
European-level dissemination	European teachers and possible future partners; periodic sharing through the school-cooperation platforms used at the time and final publication through the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform.	Throughout the project; designated partner lead.

The plan also identified indirect beneficiaries such as local authorities, public and private institutions and environmental NGOs, which could use the project as a channel for cooperation and exchange of good practices.

HISTORICAL-PLATFORM WARNING

The 2021 application referred to School Education Gateway. That platform should not be recommended as a current tool; update the platform references for the current call.

CASE-STUDY LESSON

The useful element is the structure: activity + target group + method/channel + timing + responsible person. That structure remains strong even when platforms and programme terminology change.

8.5 Chapter checklist

- Each dissemination action has a defined audience and purpose.
- Current platforms are used; obsolete platform names are removed.
- EU funding acknowledgement is planned as required.
- Sustainability includes ownership and institutional integration.
- The follow-up plan is feasible without relying on a future grant.

CHAPTER 9

Writing the application form and project summary

Write section by section, but edit across sections. The evaluator reads one project, not eleven independent answers.

9.1 The 2026 form map

Form area	What it must prove
Context / priorities / topics	Correct action and relevant policy alignment
Project description	Objectives, target groups, needs, motivation, European added value
Participating organisations	Eligibility, relevance and capacity
Cooperation arrangements	Partnership formation, strengths, management, communication, platforms, task distribution
Activities	What happens, who benefits, results, objective link and grant rationale
Budget summary	Activity allocations equal the selected project lump sum
Impact and follow-up	Measurement, organisational development, continuation and dissemination
Project summary	Concise integrated picture of objectives, implementation and results
Application conditions / annexes	Compliance, declarations and required documentation

9.2 The project summary: write it last

The summary should be understandable without the rest of the form. A practical structure is: problem and purpose -> target groups and partnership -> main activities -> expected results and impact. Avoid claims that appear nowhere else in the application.

DRAFTING FRAME

[Project] addresses [specific need] affecting [target group] in [partner contexts]. The partnership will [main objective] through [2- 4 core activity strands]. It will produce [main results] and measure success through [key indicators]. The expected impact is [individual/organisational/wider change], with results integrated through [sustainability mechanism].

9.3 Write for an evaluator, not for a brochure

- Prefer clear nouns and verbs to slogans.
- Use the same numbers, target groups and timeframes everywhere.
- Avoid unsupported superlatives such as “unique”, “revolutionary”, “guaranteed” or “the best”.
- Define acronyms once and avoid internal shorthand.
- Use EU terminology accurately, but do not imitate bureaucratic language.
- Respect the character limit shown in the current form; there is no universal 2,000-character rule for every answer.

9.4 Originality and external support

2026 APPLICATION CONDITION

The KA210-SCH application form includes declarations confirming that the application contains original content authored by the applicant organisation and that no external organisations or individuals have been paid or otherwise compensated for drafting the application. Use books, training and tools to understand the form and improve internal work - not to outsource authorship or paste generic answers.

9.5 Cross-section consistency check

Element	Where it must remain consistent
Target group	Needs, objectives, activities, impact
Partner roles	Organisation profiles, cooperation arrangements, activities
Numbers / dates	Activity details, budget rationale, impact indicators
Priority	Project description, objectives, activities, expected impact
Outputs / results	Activities, impact, dissemination, summary
Grant amount	Activity allocations and budget summary

CHAPTER 10

Ten high-risk mistakes before submission

These are not “fatal” because an evaluator dislikes them. They are high-risk because they weaken relevance, coherence, credibility or compliance.

1. Starting with travel

The project is described as a sequence of visits before a need and objective are established.

CORRECTION

Rebuild from need -> objective -> activity.

2. Priority decoration

A priority is selected but not operationalised.

CORRECTION

Trace the priority through objectives, activities and impact.

3. Copy-paste answers

Different form questions receive nearly identical text.

CORRECTION

Answer the function of each question; cross-reference the same logic without repetition.

4. Decorative partners

Partners appear in the consortium but not in responsibilities.

CORRECTION

Give every partner a necessary contribution and visible role.

5. Activity-objective mismatch

Activities are interesting but do not produce the claimed change.

CORRECTION

State the objective link and expected result for every activity.

6. Invented indicators

Percentages are used without baseline or measurement method.

CORRECTION

Use realistic targets backed by instruments and baselines where relevant.

7. Wrong budget architecture

Unit-cost tables from other Erasmus+ actions are applied to KA210.

CORRECTION

Use the EUR 30,000 / EUR 60,000 lump-sum model and activity allocations.

8. Overclaiming digital tools

eTwinning or another platform is presented as mandatory or as proof of quality by itself.

CORRECTION

Explain what the tool enables and use accurate programme language.

9. Outdated platform references

Old services such as School Education Gateway remain in current guidance.

CORRECTION

Use current European School Education Platform/eTwinning terminology where relevant.

10. Last-minute consistency failure

Names, dates, participant numbers or results differ across sections.

CORRECTION

Run a final cross-section audit and submit with time for technical problems.

CHAPTER 11

Adaptable drafting frameworks - use, do not copy

Sentence structures can help you think. They should never replace original project-specific authorship.

USE RULE

Draft from your evidence first. Then use these frames to test whether the logic is complete. Rewrite everything in the applicant organisation's own language and check it against the current form.

11.1 Needs and context

DRAFTING FRAME

Our [institution/target group] currently faces [specific need], evidenced by [data/source]. This affects [who/how]. Existing measures [limitation]. The partnership is needed because [transnational reason].

11.2 Priority alignment

DRAFTING FRAME

The project contributes to [priority] by addressing [specific challenge]. This contribution is operationalised through [objective/activity], and progress will be evidenced by [indicator].

11.3 Objective

DRAFTING FRAME

By [time], [target group/organisation] will [observable change], measured through [instrument], reaching [credible target/baseline change].

11.4 Partner justification

DRAFTING FRAME

[Partner] contributes [specific asset] that is necessary for [objective/activity]. It will lead [responsibility] and contribute to [other task]. This complements [other partner strength] by [explanation].

11.5 Activity rationale

DRAFTING FRAME

This activity advances Objective [X] by [mechanism]. [Target group] will [core tasks]. The expected result is [observable result], verified through [evidence]. The allocated grant amount reflects [main resource drivers].

11.6 Impact

DRAFTING FRAME

Success will be assessed through [indicator] using [instrument] at [timing]. The expected change is [outcome], while longer-term integration will be supported by [institutional mechanism].

11.7 Dissemination

DRAFTING FRAME

[Result] will be shared with [audience] through [channel/format] at [time]. [Partner/person/role] will be responsible, and uptake will be monitored through [evidence].

11.8 Sustainability

DRAFTING FRAME

After the grant period, [organisation/role] will continue [specific practice/result] through [existing process/resource]. Continuation will be reviewed [frequency/method].

11.9 Language that often weakens credibility

Avoid as default	Prefer
"transformative journey", "revolutionary", "unique"	Name the actual change and evidence
"evaluators love..."	State the relevant criterion or programme expectation
"guaranteed success"	No ethical editor or trainer can guarantee funding
"insider secret"	Explain the method transparently
"we will disseminate widely"	Specify audience, channel, timing, owner and evidence

APPENDIX A

2026 form map and final submission checklist

A.1 Form-to-chapter map

2026 form section	Use this book
Priorities and topics	Chapter 1
Project description	Chapters 1-2
Participating organisations	Chapter 3
Cooperation arrangements	Chapter 4
Activities	Chapter 5
Budget summary	Chapter 6
Impact and follow-up	Chapters 7-8
Project summary	Chapter 9
Application conditions and final check	Chapters 9-10

A.2 Final submission checklist

- ☐ Current Programme Guide and current call/form checked.
- ☐ Applicant and partner eligibility confirmed; OIDs checked.
- ☐ Partnership minimum and application-participation limitations checked for the current deadline.
- ☐ Priority selection matches the project and national context where relevant.
- ☐ Needs, objectives, activities, results and impact form one traceable chain.

- All activities have lead organisation, target group, expected result, objective link and grant rationale.
- Activity grant allocations equal exactly EUR 30,000 or EUR 60,000.
- Internal total project cost and co-financing logic are realistic.
- Impact indicators and instruments are defined.
- Dissemination, EU funding acknowledgement and sustainability measures are concrete.
- All names, numbers, dates and partner roles are consistent.
- Originality/authorship declarations can be made truthfully.
- Required annexes and declarations are present.
- Application has been proofread and a PDF/export copy archived before submission.
- Submission is completed before the deadline with time for technical issues.

APPENDIX B

Historical 2021 case-study extracts

HISTORICAL MATERIAL

The pages in this appendix come from a 2021 KA210-SCH application. They are included to study project logic and writing structure. The form, platforms, terminology and budget architecture must be checked against 2026 rules before reuse.

Case-study reference: Young Ecologists on a Mission: Saving Our Seas, 2021-2-RO01-KA210-SCH-000047905. Romanian selection result: 89 points; EUR 60,000 grant approved.

B.1 Needs and goals

The 2021 application described a shared challenge across coastal schools: growing pollution pressure in tourist areas combined with uneven ecological knowledge, limited practical experience in investigating coastal environments, communication gaps and insufficient knowledge of European environmental policy. The schools also reported useful assets: direct proximity to the sea, prior ecological projects, volunteering experience, language and digital skills, and existing cooperation between institutions.

The proposed response was a beach-ecology project that combined scientific observation, civic participation and public communication. Activities were intended to help students first change their own behaviour - observing, recycling, protecting and respecting nature - and then persuade others through campaigns and educational products.

Transnational cooperation was justified as a way to compare different European coastal settings, test and exchange local investigation methods, run public-awareness work in several countries and create a larger

network of young “ecology messengers”. The application argued that wider geographic reach would increase civic involvement and multiply community impact.

HISTORICAL SOURCE

Paraphrased from Project Description, pp. 5-6 of the 2021 application.

B.2 Objectives

Objective area	Paraphrased 2021 content
Overall civic involvement	Engage at least 1,000 people, including 200 students aged 14-18.
Community campaigns	Inform and mobilise 12 communities in Romania, Italy, Spain and Turkey around clean beaches, pollution risks and responsible habits.
Responsible citizenship	Help the 200 participating students understand the importance of pollution-free coastal areas and model responsible behaviour in their communities.
Environmental knowledge	Set a target for 75% of students to identify at least three ways of reducing beach pollution and three ways of reducing water pollution.
Key competences	Develop practical, artistic, linguistic, digital, communication and ICT skills among at least half of participating students and all participating teachers.

Expected results included stronger school-community links, improved ecological knowledge, better beach-profile investigation techniques, English-language presentation of scientific findings, creative outputs such as exhibitions and films, information panels and a Beach Calendar, a good-practice guide, and a website intended to remain usable after the project.

HISTORICAL SOURCE

Paraphrased from Project Description, p. 5 of the 2021 application.

B.3 Partnership logic

The partnership was constructed around coastal diversity and comparable pressure from tourism. The coordinator in Romania worked with schools in Antalya (Turkey), Venice (Italy) and Lloret de Mar in

Catalonia (Spain), allowing the project to connect different European coastal environments and compare how human activity affected them.

- **Geographic complementarity:** different coastal and marine contexts created a basis for comparison.
- **Shared local reality:** all partner schools were located in tourist areas exposed to seasonal pressure and human-generated pollution.
- **Experience mix:** the consortium combined Erasmus+ and eTwinning experience, international-event capacity and partners with different levels of strategic-partnership experience.
- **Existing trust:** participating schools had previous or ongoing links with Romanian schools, reducing the risk of beginning cooperation from zero.

The underlying partnership argument was not simply “four countries”. It was that each organisation offered a relevant coastal context and enough cooperation capacity to make comparison, peer learning and transfer possible.

HISTORICAL SOURCE

Paraphrased from Cooperation Arrangements, p. 16 of the 2021 application.

B.4 Task distribution

Task	Historical allocation, paraphrased
Local project promotion	All participating schools.
Host-country beach investigation day	Each host school; methods/techniques strand led by the Italian partner.
Photo exhibitions and common Seaside Calendar	All schools contributed; Romanian partner coordinated the shared calendar.
EcoSeas contest	Local stages in every school; Turkish partner coordinated the strand.
Demonstration lessons	Every school integrated local beach investigation into at least one natural-sciences lesson.
Website / social-media dissemination	All activities contributed; Spanish partner coordinated the online strand.
Project coordination and reporting	Coordinator centralised management data and reporting; financial and legal duties were separately assigned.

HISTORICAL SOURCE

Paraphrased from Cooperation Arrangements, p. 17 of the 2021 application.

B.5 Dissemination

Dissemination action	Target / function	Historical timing
Web and Facebook pages	Project identity, contacts, objectives, activities and progress for students, teachers, parents and wider audiences.	Created at project launch.
Press conference	Initial public announcement for the school community, local authorities, media and possible partners.	Early launch phase.
EcoSeas Corner	Permanent school exhibition showing project information, ecological slogans, implementation progress and results.	Maintained throughout the project.
Press and radio-TV coverage	Periodic communication of activities and results to local, regional and national audiences.	Throughout implementation.
Dissemination sessions	Transfer lessons and good practices after international learning activities.	Within two weeks after each mobility.
European dissemination	Periodic sharing with the European teacher community and final visibility through the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform.	Throughout implementation.

The application also anticipated benefits for local authorities, public/private institutions and environmental NGOs through access to project practices and opportunities for European cooperation.

HISTORICAL NOTE

School Education Gateway appears in the 2021 source and is retained only as historical context. Current editions should use current Erasmus+ school-education platforms.

B.6 Project summary

The historical summary condensed the project into three blocks: objectives, implementation and expected results.

Summary block	Paraphrased 2021 content
Objectives	Inform and mobilise 12 European coastal communities; educate young people as

	responsible citizens; reduce beach and water pollution; and develop practical skills for pollution prevention.
Implementation	Monitor and investigate beaches near partner schools; run public campaigns on plastic-pollution risks; develop an Android application showing garbage levels in selected beach zones; install information panels; and create educational materials on beach and water pollution.
Expected continuation	Keep project web/social and eTwinning channels active with periodic ecological updates, strengthen the visibility of participating schools and create a basis for future transnational cooperation on ecological topics.

HISTORICAL SOURCE

Paraphrased from Project Summary, p. 34 of the 2021 application.

REFERENCES

Official sources and further reading

The publication has been edited against the following official or primary sources. Always consult the live/current version before applying.

European Commission - Erasmus+ Programme Guide 2026: Small-scale Partnerships

[Open official source](#)

European Commission - 2026 KA210-SCH application form template (Round 1)

[Open official source](#)

Erasmus+ Project Results Platform

[Open official source](#)

European School Education Platform / eTwinning

[Open official source](#)

Romanian National Agency selection results - KA210-SCH EUR 60,000, 2021 Round 2

[Open official source](#)

Version note

Editorial status: revised for publication in August 2026. Programme-specific statements were checked against the Erasmus+ 2026 Small-scale Partnerships guidance and the 2026 KA210-SCH application form available at the time of editing. Where official web pages contain legacy fragments, the current action architecture and current application template have been given priority.

ABOUT AFEDE

Education, training and European development

AFEDE develops educational resources, training and European cooperation initiatives for educators and organisations. This book is part of its practical publishing and training work on European project development.

Contact

Email: contact@afede.ro

Website: <https://afede.ro>

Facebook: [AFEDE Europe](#)

AFEDE PUBLISHING

PRACTICAL ERASMUS+ GUIDE

WINNING ERASMUS+ PROJECTS

A practical, publication-ready guide for organisations preparing Erasmus+ KA210 Small-scale Partnership applications. The book follows the logic of the 2026 application form: relevance and needs, objectives, partnership, cooperation arrangements, activities, lump-sum budgeting, impact, dissemination and final quality control. A historical case study from a funded Romanian KA210-SCH project is used to show what remains transferable from a successful application, while clearly separating 2021 examples from the rules that apply in 2026.

11

chapters

2

appendices

1

funded historical case study

2026

application-form alignment



AFEDE Publishing

Constanța • 2026

Electronic publication • PDF

afede.ro • contact@afede.ro

ISBN 978-630-95433-1-8